

### **REMARKS**


In response to the Office Action dated July 24, 2006, in the above case, claims 30-34, 36 and 74-85 have been cancelled as requested by the Examiner.

In the Office Action dated November 3, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 11-20, 51-59, 64-73 and 86-88 based on 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarbox et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0169701). In response, Applicants respectfully submit the enclosed Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 to establish invention of the subject matter of the rejected claims prior to the effective date of Tarbox et al. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that Tarbox et al. is not a prior art reference for these claims and that these claims therefore are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of the case, it is requested that the undersigned counsel be contacted for that purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

**DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
R. Blake Johnston, Reg. No. 41,097

Dated: 8/24/06

P.O. Box 64807  
Chicago, Illinois 60664-0807

Phone 312-368-8921  
Fax: 312-630-6310